



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/822,627	03/30/2001	Lakshmi Balaji	10010891-1	7115

7590 09/01/2006

HEWLETT-PACKARD COMPANY
Intellectual property Administration
P.O. Box 272400
Fort Collins, CO 80527-2400

EXAMINER

WOZNIAK, JAMES S

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2626

DATE MAILED: 09/01/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/822,627

Applicant(s)

BALAJI ET AL.

Examiner

James S. Wozniak

Art Unit

2626

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 01 April 2006.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1,2,10-22 and 24-31 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1,2,10-22 and 24-31 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 30 March 2001 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
- ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

1. In response to the office action from 2/2/2006, the applicant has submitted a request for continued examination, filed 4/1/2006, amending claims 1-2, 10-16, and 21-22, while canceling claims 3-9, adding claims 24-31, and arguing to traverse the art rejection based on the amended limitations (*Amendment, Pages 9-15*). The applicant's arguments have been fully considered but are moot with respect to the new grounds of rejection in view of Kennelly et al (*U.S. Patent: 6,559,861*).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

3. **Claims 1-2, 10, 12-13, 15-17, 20-22, 25-26, and 30-31** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Kennelly et al (*U.S. Patent: 6,559,861*).

With respect to **Claims 1 and 21-22**, Kennelly discloses:

A message catalog configured to store a plurality of localized text strings, each localized text string uniquely identified by only a string identifier and a language identifier (*text string values and language file descriptors stored in memory that are used to uniquely identify a localized text string, Col. 6, Line 46- Col. 8, Line 24*);

A localized string retrieval function configured to retrieve from the message catalog a particular one of the localized text strings according to only the string identifier and language identifier (*searching memory directories for a localized text string based on language and string variables, Col. 8, Line 6- Col. 9, Line 17*);

A file processable by a web browser to display, in a selected one of the multiple languages, the text included in the file (*HTML web page document processable by a web browser, Col. 6, Lines 46-51; and Col. 8, Lines 6-43*), wherein the file does not include the localized strings corresponding to the text messages (*uniform web page that does not contain the localized text strings, Col. 8, Lines 6-24*), the file having a URL, that is the same for any of the multiple languages (*same URL used for different languages, Col. 11, Lines 20-27*);

A web server configured to provide the file to the web browser (*Fig. 1, Element 24*), the web browser configured to display a particular one of the text messages in the selected language by executing the localized string retrieval function corresponding to the particular text message so as to obtain the text in the selected language (*HTML web browser capable of producing localized web pages through the use of text string values and language file descriptors, Col. 6, Line 46- Col. 9, Line 17*).

Kennelly further discloses method implementation as a program stored on a computer readable medium (*Col. 14, Lines 26-30*).

With respect to **Claim 2**, Kennelly recites:

The localized string retrieval function retrieves the localized string according to the string identifier from the message catalog for each text message in the file (*string retrieval as applied to claim 1, and translating all text strings in a web page, Col. 6, Lines 46-58; and Col. 7, Line 60- Col. 8, Line 5*).

With respect to **Claim 10**, Kennelly discloses the HTML web page document processable by a web browser as applied to Claim 1.

With respect to **Claim 12**, Kennelly discloses the system for providing a web page in multiple languages as applied to Claim 1, and further discloses:

Request a file using a web browser (*HTML web page document viewing through the use of a web browser, Col. 6, Lines 46-51; Col. 8, Lines 6-43; and Col. 2, Lines 53-61*), the file having a URL that is the same for any of the multiple languages (*same URL used for different languages, Col. 11, Lines 20-27*);

Identifying a predetermined language (*determining a selected language, Col. 9, Lines 5-17*);

Contacting the message catalog with a particular string identifier and the predetermined language to retrieve a particular localized string corresponding to a particular one of the text messages (web browser for *producing localized web pages through the use of text string values and language file descriptors, Col. 8, Line 25- Col. 9, Line 41*);

Uniquely determining the particular localized string at the message catalog using only the particular string identifier and the predetermined language (*Col. 6, Line 46- Col. 9, Line 17*).

With respect to **Claim 13**, Kennelly further recites:

Displaying the particular localized string to a user of the web browser (*Col. 8, Lines 25-31; and Figs. 2-3*).

With respect to **Claim 15**, Kennelly further recites:

The user specifies the predetermined language (*user selection of a desired language, Col. 9, Lines 14-17*).

With respect to **Claim 16**, Kennelly discloses:

Executing a get language identifier function (*script used to search for a particular language variable, Col. 9, Lines 31-56*); and

Obtaining a language identifier corresponding to the predetermined language from the get language identifier function (*obtaining a language file name, Col. 7, Lines 36-59*).

With respect to **Claim 17**, Kennelly discloses:

Determining whether the message catalog is supported by the device (*determining if a selected language directory is supported at a database, Col. 7, Line 60- Col. 8, Line 5*); and

Returning a default language of the message catalog when the message catalog is not supported (*Col. 7, line 60- Col. 8, Line 5*).

With respect to **Claim 20**, Kennelly recites:

Prior to the step of contacting the message catalog further comprising the step of contacting the message catalog with a character set identifier (*specifying a character font set to be associated with a language identifier, Col. 10, Lines 38-54*).

With respect to **Claim 25**, Kennelly discloses:

The web browser provides a language identifier corresponding to the selected language in executing the localized string retrieval function (*Fig. 7; and Col. 8, Lines 25-30*).

With respect to **Claim 26**, Kennelly recites:

The file is a plurality of files, and wherein a single message catalog stores the localized text strings for all of the plurality of files (multiple translation memory directories for multiple web pages Col. 3, Lines 21-32).

With respect to **Claims 30-31**, Kennelly discloses the sever having a message catalog that is capable of communicating translated web pages to a browser as applied to Claim 1 and shown in Fig. 1.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. **Claims 11 and 14** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kennelly et al in view of Williams (*U.S. Patent: 6,591,272*).

With respect to **Claim 11**, Kennelly discloses the system for generating a web page in a selected language through the use of language and string values, as applied to Claim 1. Kennelly further discloses a string retrieval function utilizing PEARL or another scripting code (*Col. 9, Lines 31-41*). Kennelly does not specifically suggest the use of C code, however Williams teach the use of such a C code in a foreign language web page translation (*Col. 2, Line 66- Col. 3, Line 2; and Col. 7, Lines 46-51*).

Kennelly and Williams are analogous art because they are from a similar field of endeavor in user interface translation. Thus, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art, at the time of invention, to modify the teachings of Kennelly with the use of C code in a foreign language web page translation to implement an additional well known language for associating database objects (*Williams, Col. 2, Line 66- Col. 3, Line 2*).

With respect to **Claim 14**, Williams further discloses:

Returning the length of the particular localized string (*data object length used to ensure that a data object does not exceed a maximum field length, Col. 50, Lines 14-19*).

6. **Claims 18-19** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kennelly et al in view of Hauduc et al (*U.S. Patent: 6,859,820*).

With respect to **Claim 18**, Kennelly discloses the system for generating a web page in a selected language capable of determining if a particular language directory is supported, as applied to Claim 17. Although Kennelly discloses returning a localized string for a specified language, as applied to Claim 15, Kennelly does not specifically suggest returning a default language of a server language directory if a user has not specified a language setting, however Hauduc teaches the use of such a server specified default language setting (*Col. 6, Lines 19-31*).

Kennelly and Hauduc are analogous art because they are from a similar field of endeavor in user interface translation. Thus, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art, at the time of invention, to modify the teachings of Kennelly with the step of returning a default language of a server language directory if a user has not specified a language setting as

taught by Hauduc in order to provide a web application in a different language even if a user has not specified a language preference (*Hauduc, Col. 1, Lines 59-64; and Col. 6, Lines 19-31*).

With respect to **Claim 19**, Hauduc discloses:

Determining whether there is a default language of the device; (*determining whether there is a default operating system language at a server, Col. 6, Lines 19-31*);

Returning the specified language when there is a default language of the device (*setting a language variable to a default operating system language if it exists, Col. 6, Lines 19-31*); and

Returning a default language of the message catalog when there is no default language of the device (*setting a language variable to a server directory default if an operating system default language does not exist at a server, Col. 6, Lines 19-31*).

7. **Claims 24 and 27-28** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kennelly et al in view of Thurston (*U.S. Patent: 6,865,716*).

With respect to **Claim 24**, Kennelly discloses the system for generating a web page in a selected language through the use of language and string values, as applied to Claim 1. Kennelly does not specifically suggest a text message including a reference to a localized string retrieval function with an associated string identifier, however Thurston recites a “getstring” function and an associated index corresponding to a text string (*Col. 6, Lines 1-65*).

Kennelly and Thurston are analogous art because they are from a similar field of endeavor in user interface translation. Thus, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art, at the time of invention, to modify the teachings of Kennelly with the “getstring”

function” disclosed by Thurston in order to further enable dynamic document localization through the use of locale neutral contents (*Thurston, Col. 1, Lines 57-61*).

With respect to **Claim 27**, Kennelly discloses the system for generating a web page in a selected language through the use of language and string values, as applied to Claim 1. Kennelly does not specifically suggest multiple message catalogs corresponding to multiple HTML files, however Thurston recites message tables that are searched based upon a string index and language identifier corresponding to a specific HTML file (*Col. 4, Line 36- Col. 6, Line 65*).

Kennelly and Thurston are analogous art because they are from a similar field of endeavor in user interface translation. Thus, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art, at the time of invention, to modify the teachings of Kennelly with the message tables disclosed by Thurston in order to further enable dynamic document localization through the use of locale neutral contents (*Thurston, Col. 1, Lines 57-61*).

With respect to **Claim 28**, Thurston further recites a get language function executed prior to the execution of a string index function (*Col. 6, Lines 1-65*).

8. **Claim 29** is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kennelly et al in view of Thurston, and further in view of Hauduc et al.

With respect to **Claim 29**, Kennelly in view of Thurston discloses the system for generating a web page in a selected language through the use of a get string function, as applied to Claim 28. Also, Thurston further discloses:

Provides a user-specified language identifier if a default language of the web browser has been overridden by a user (*overriding a default browser language*, Col. 6, Line 66- Col. 7, Line 6); and

Provides a default language identifier of the web browser if the default language of the web browser has not been overridden by the user (*default browser setting*, Col. 6, Line 66- Col. 7, Line 6).

Kennelly in view of Thurston does not specifically suggest returning a default language of a server language directory if a user has not specified a language setting, however Hauduc teaches the use of such a server specified default language setting (*Col. 6, Lines 19-31*).

Kennelly, Thurston, and Hauduc are analogous art because they are from a similar field of endeavor in user interface translation. Thus, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art, at the time of invention, to modify the teachings of Kennelly in view of Thurston with the step of returning a default language of a server language directory if a user has not specified a language setting as taught by Hauduc in order to provide a web application in a different language even if a user has not specified a language preference (*Hauduc*, Col. 1, Lines 59-64; and Col. 6, Lines 19-31).

Conclusion

9. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure:

Heiny (*U.S. Patent: 5,778,356*)- teaches the retrieval of text strings using a language handle and a string pointer.


Graham et al (*U.S. Patent Publication: 2002/0046240*)- teaches a web server capable of searching for a localized text string using a "getString" function.

10. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to James S. Wozniak whose telephone number is (571) 272-7632. The examiner can normally be reached on M-Th, 7:30-5:00, F, 7:30-4, Off Alternate Fridays.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, David Hudspeth can be reached at (571) 272-7843. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

James S. Wozniak
8/29/2006



DAVID HUDSPETH
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600